heard him preach often. We have discussed many things together. Indeed, he is one of the most dedicated and sincere men I have ever known. His insights are profound and his ability to communicate superior. But, ironically, some auditor's attitudes are so set that nothing can change them regardless of one's ability to talk. Our prayers are with him and his wife, Sara Bea. —*Missouri*

I am surprised at myself that I am writing you to tell you that you should never have printed it. This coming from the "hunted" is like "witch hunts." While I have no way of determining the total accuracy of this statement, I feel that he has been "wounded" in the place we all hate to be struck—our ego. I, and I feel sure that you also, have been the victim of our own immaturity and the only profitable course to follow is to GROW UP . . . You speak of the desire to see unity come to pass, but in the final anlysis are you not contributing to spiritual and religious chaos?—*Pennsylvania*

David Elkins' letter is so tragic, but many of us know it's true. *We must not think!* Just follow the old party line. Of course, being a woman your thinking has surely been limited. So very young I learned that if you want anyone to listen, quote a well-known preacher. So I memorized what he said, in what paper and what time . . . I want to thank you for your raw courage and for the *Review*. I've read the last one five times!—*Oklahoma* (a cancer victim, one "constantly in pain")

Have just finished D. Elkins' letter. My! How old memories flooded me. I counted my own "unchurched" letters and had 12 of them. Think of it, been canned 12 times. Wow!—*Oregon*

Your paper continues to be one of the few sources of refreshment published by our brethren. Especially touching was that sad letter by a former school friend of mine, David Elkins. I, too, have been the defrocked route and I know how he feels. Keep on challenging us with you timely articles.—*Alabama*

It seems that we have run off a lot of folk, doesn't it? It just may be that they love God and serve Christ just as much as before. It is important for us to remember that in leaving the Church of Christ (or being run off) one does not necessarily leave Christ. It may be due to his love for God that one makes his departure, and not for a lack of it.——*Ed.*

This is the September, 1969 issue of *Restoration Review,* Vol. 11, No. 7. The last issue was the June number. We do not publish in July or August. The ten issues for the year comprise a 200-page book, with introduction and table of contents, at the close of the year. You may reserve the hard-bound edition in advance, but need not send any money.

We would appreciate your help in introducing our efforts to your concerned friends, people who believe in being real Christians in a real world. In clubs of six or more you can subscribe for friends at the rate of only 50 cents per name. Otherwise 1.00 per year, though we encourage subs of two years at a time.

RESTORATION REVIEW

(drawing by Will Slocum)

TOUCH OF TENDERNESS

It is something like the sweet and innocent touch of a child that will point the way to renewed relationship between brothers who are separated by the party spirit. The tender loving care of a child can teach us more about brotherhood than a lectureship full of words.

See UNITY MEET IN NEW YORK page 136

Volume 11, No. 7 September, 1969

A Review of "Churches of Christ in America" in The Religious Situation 1969 . . .

A NEW DRUM BEAT

Those of us in Churches of Christ will be interested in a recently published essay entitled "Churches of Christ in America" by Edwin S. Gaustad, which is part of a large volume (1100 pages) called *The Religious Situation*: 1969, published by Beacon Press in Boston. It is the second in a series of annual volumes designed to describe the religious situation throughout the world.

Elsewhere in this issue we explain how our readers can make an easy purchase of these volumes, but inasmuch as most will not be inclined to spend 15.00 for the volume in question, we thought it proper to review this particular essay about us. It provides us with something very rare: a critical analysis of our place in the religious world by a responsible scholar from the outside. Heretofore no one has paid us any mind when viewing the religious scene. Now we are alongside Maoism and Religion in China Today, The Pentecostal Conquest of Chile, The Underground Church, and the *Humanae Vitae* of Pope Paul VI. Since it is an evaluation that will no doubt be read extensively and with great interest, it would be inappropriate for us not to know about it.

Dr. Edwin S. Gaustad is professor of history at the University of California at Riverside. Recently he has been on leave working on a special project on Religion-Social Studies curricula for public secondary schools at Florida State University. Last year he published *Religious Issues in American History*. We are unaware of any connection on his part with Churches of Christ save that of a research scholar interested in American religion.

The study begins by pointing to the significance of the idea of restoration, which Gaustad refers to as "this Janus vision" (Janus being the Roman god of *beginnings*), and which swept across the American frontier. He sees the movement led by Campbell, Scott, and Stone as "the strongest member of the Protestant American restoration family," a recognition that the Janus vision neither began nor ended with us. He dates our beginning with Thomas Campbell's *Declaration and Address* in 1809, and he shows how the movement grew to more than a million members during its first century, building colleges and societies along the way, and joining the Federal Council of Churches in 1908, the National Council in 1950, and participating in the Consultation on Church Union during the 1960's. He explains, however, that there were those in the movement that did not go along with the modernistic innovations, and that from the beginning of the present century "the churches of Christ" knew themselves to be of another mind, of a different fellowship." And he invariably uses the small "c"—as painstakingly as if he were a staff writer for the *Gospel Advocate!*

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly (except July and August) at 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Texas. Leroy Garrett, Editor. Second class permit at Denton, Texas. Subscription rate is $1.00 per annum; 50 cents in clubs of 6 or more.

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas 76201.

After grappling with the impossible problem of church statistics, including our own awkward efforts to count our own noses, Gaustad estimates that we have from 12,000 to 14,000 congregations with an average membership of from 100 to 150, with a total membership of something less than two million. Though he sees us as a national movement, he takes notice of the fact that in 1906 we had 2,649 churches, with half of them in Texas and Tennessee. A decade later the number of churches had doubled, with half of them still limited to only four states (Texas, Tennessee, Arkansas and Oklahoma). He sees us as largely a border state church, with California and the West Coast being an exception in the last decade of growth.

He sees our mission work abroad hampered by a lack of national supervision and support, but is impressed nonetheless that we have strength in many areas: 70 congregations in Japan, 100 in India, 32 in Australia and 44 in Italy. He concludes that our mission program is of sufficient force to have a broadening influence on the churches at home.

There is this strange comparison: "Like ancient Mithraism, the churches of Christ appear where American armies are placed, thus there are congregations in such unlikely places as the Azores, Greenland, Afghanistan, and Guam." He could have just as well mentioned that Mithraism was for men only, and had a more valid reference, for we have so subjected the woman's role as to have what is tantamount to a man's church.

Dr. Gaustad is, however, more interested in what is happening to us qualitatively than in our history and numerical growth. He asks a lively question: "Is there any sense in which this scattered, fractured, and fractious group is where the action is? To a surprising extent, the answer to that question is 'yes'."

When scholars are writing critical essays, they are not trying to say nice things particularly, but I consider this a compliment to our people, about the nicest thing that could be said of an expanding church. We *are* where the action is, or at least we are moving in this direction.

This he says because we seem willing to shed "the old concentration on the minutiae, the anise and cumin of the law." Our exclusivism and Pharisaism still has its defenders, but they no longer go unchallenged. He sees the journals among us as providing clues regarding shifting views. He cites four areas in which we are making significant changes, changes that move us from the old toward the new.

1. *A disenchantment with the hoary cliches, especially those related to instrumental music.*

Here he quotes Carl Ketcherside in *Mission Messenger* as one who wishes to recapture "that spirit of brotherly love which transcends divergent views about the instrument," and he tells of Ketcherside's desire to transfer this aged issue from the box labeled "Differences Which Divide" to the box named "Differences Which Do Not Divide."

2. *The minutiae are not regarded with the same seriousness as before.*

While he grants that we are still fussy about things like a little "c" for *church* and a little "b" for *brother,* he sees us as moving toward larger concerns. Here he quotes Robert Myers in *Restoration Review* as an instance of how we have begun to criticize ourselves: " . . . the Church of Christ, having failed to develop a philosophy for handling differences of opinion, is fated to pass endlessly from one unnecessary tragedy to another." Gaustad admits that a philosophy that can handle differences is still undeveloped, but he sees a pragmatic tolerance as more pervasive than before.

3. *The sense of exclusiveness, the assurance of truth possessed in the round, the idea of being Christ's true and only church no longer goes unchallenged.*

He sees these as still moving to and fro across the land. We must concede that the professor in his research comes up with our number.

> Almost proverbial has been the penchant of these Christians to be polemical in their dealing with all other Christians. They were right; all others were wrong. They understood the New Testament and obeyed it; other did neither. Arguments and answers and biblical texts were memorized, even by children, to meet every counter position, to parry every heterodox thrust. So armed with the sword of the spirit, it was easy to gut in their place all Methodists, Baptists, Disciples, Catholics, Christian Scientists, and, on occasion, even pagans.

But he is impressed with the attack against Pharisaism from *within* Church of Christ ranks, and here he quotes President Norvel Young of Pepperdine College, who asked only this year in the pages of the *Gospel Advocate* why we write about "a congregation of the church of Christ." Says Young: "Why be redundant? Or are we really saying 'churches of the church of Christ denomination.' I hope not, but I am sure that many of our neighbors hear that whether we intend to say it or not." Gaustad is further impressed with Young's casual comment that the expression "church of Christ" does not even appear in the New Testament.

The "hottest blast" against our Pharisaism, however, comes from Prof. David Reagan in *Restoration Review,* according to Gaustad. He sees Reagan's "Pharisaism in the Church of Christ" as "a new—and useful—Prayer of General Confession."

> . . . we of the Church of Christ have killed the spirit of New Testament Christianity! Yes, the sin of Pharisaism is on our hearts . . . We have been obsessed for over a century with a legalistic restoration of New Testament Christianity . . . we have been engulfed in a narrow concern for the restoration of outward forms and external appearances. We have devoted our energies to superficialities . . . we have been more guilty of Pharisaism than were the original Pharisees themselves . . . We have endlessly stressed the passing of the Old Law, but failed to realize that it was not simply replaced with a New Law.

Gaustad has his touches of humor, one of which follows this blast from Reagan: "Professor Reagan need only have added '. . . and there is no health in us'."

This section on the passing of The Old is followed in Gaustad's study by a consideration of the fresh currents of The New, and here too he lists four developments.

1. *The powerful leaven of education is clearly responsible for much uneasy movement in the whole denominational loaf.*

As a historian would, Gaustad observes that one of the curious anomalies of sectarian life in America is that groups disdaining an educated ministry go on to produce an educated laity. So with us. He thinks the gap we have between an emerging educated laity and the less educated clergy would be less aggravated if we had national leadership. He sees us as committed more and more to higher education.

The professor has done his homework. He knows that Bethany College was started by Campbell, but realizes it is not now a Church of Christ college. He names the four most influencial: Lipscomb, ACC, Harding, and Pepperdine. And he knows we have no seminaries (though *really* we do, though by other names). And he knows what is going on in the colleges, e.g., he observes: "That influence is not all in one direction, to be sure, for but few of the rigid patterns of the past go unexamined by the collegiate youth."

2. *The higher level of publishing is as apparent as it is promising.*

Here *Mission* magazine draws special praise as being both learned and nonparochial. Aware that the magazine is viewed by some as "definitely the mouthpiece for a far-out liberal movement in the church," Gaustad is impressed with *Mission's* editorial response to such attacks.

> Having devoted ourselves so long to correcting the religious errors of others, we have come to intensely resist any notion that we might be wrong on something . . . We're not intellectually perfect any more than we are morally perfect. We don't make the latter boast; nor should we imply the former. The proper attitude is an openness to learn and receive truth *regardless of its source.* The ground of the Christian's confidence is not that *he* knows, but that God knows *him.*

3. *The higher quality of issues now receiving full debate among members of the churches of Christ.*

The researchist acknowledges that those he is studying are skilled debaters, having talents that are often wasted on superficial issues. But now they are turning to larger forums, theological and sociological, intellectual and political. The concerns now deal with campus unrest, inner city, underdeveloped nations, Negro revolution, pacifism, and "the servant church", subjects drawn from *Mission* magazine. Still others from *20th Century Christian* caught Gaustad's eye: The Christian in the City, Christianity and Science, Christ and Race Relations.

Says Gaustad: "If Texas and Tennessee—the proven strongholds—display editorial initiative of this calibre, can the total brotherhood be far behind?

Only one congregation is singled out in Gaustad's analysis, and that is the Madison church near Nashville. But not for its size or for the awards it has won, but for its efforts toward integration. He quotes Ira North, the minister, in his reply to the complaint that intergration would disturb the church's building program.

> Our reply was that the Madison congregation started out some 34 years ago in an old garage. When it would rain on the Lord's Day, the Bible school teachers would stand in water, as it ran through the old garage, to teach the Bible. If practicing what we preached meant going back to the old garage and losing our multi-million dollar facility, we were prepared to go back.

4. *The churches of Christ are willing to look at their own foibles and failings—and smile.*

The professor sees no indication that we are taking the work of God and the gospel of Christ any less seriously than ever, but we are learning to take ourselves less seriously. Here he points to the *Restoration Review* again and to the article about the imaginary bumper stickers. *Don't Dance—Park! Attend the Church of My Choice,* and *Fight Eggheadism—Start Your Neighborhood Christian College Today!* are viewed as instances of being willing to laugh at our own foibles.

Gaustad is especially impressed with a piece appearing in *Mission* entitled "Pseudo Amos" in which a "nonprophet" pronounces woes on the sects, then comes closer home to cast fire on the Disciples. While Israel (Churches of Christ) enjoys hearing her neighbors castigated, the fire falls on her too, as it did in the case of the Amos of old. Gaustad reproduces these lines from *Mission*:

Thus says the Lord:
For three transgressions of the Disciples of Christ and for four, I will not revoke the punishment;
because they sing with flutes and lyres and organs and make strange noises unto the Lord.
So I will send a fire upon the prodigal sons of Campbell and it shall devour the strongholds of Bethany.
Thus says the Lord:
For three transgressions of the Churches of Christ and for four, I will not revoke the punishment;
because they sell the inner city for suburban sanctuaries and the ghetto for heated baptistries and soft lights;
they that trample the head of the indigents and immigrants and turn aside the way of the addicts and alcoholics.
Hear the word that the Lord has spoken against you, O Churches of Christ:
You only have I known of all the churches of the earth; therefore, I will punish you for all your iniquities.
Woe to us who sit on padded pews and relax ourselves on theatre-seats;
Who sing spiritual ditties without the sound of the harp and unlike David, do not invent for ourselves instruments of music;
Who drink Welch's grape juice in individual cups and anoint ourselves with the finest of cosmetics;
But are not grieved over the ruin of our people!
Therefore, we shall now be the first to go into exile, and the revelry of those who are relaxed shall pass away.

Such references Gaustad sees as "evidences of a new drum beat heard within the marching ranks of the churches of Christ." He concludes that we are "an energetic youngster among America's ecclesiastical bodies. It has idealism and good health—along with some of the awkwardness of adolescence." One may suppose from his concluding words that he likes us well enough and that he has hopes that we may someday be part of the answer.

Says he: "Puberty can be a painful, lonely time, but on its other side the creative possibilities of maturity beckon."

So goes a reasonable and responsible piece of work on what surely must be one of America's most interesting religious groups.

Dr. Gaustad could not, of course, touch all the bases in a mere 20-page treatment, but we must admit that some omissions surprised us, some so significant that he must not have known about them, as careful as he was in his research. *Voices of Concern: Critical Essays in Church of Christism* is not referred to at all, and yet it is unique in religious publication, being a compilation of essays by people willing to criticize their own church. Missing also is any reference

to the *Christian Chronicle,* which in recent years has featured such dynamic reporting as could hardly be expected of a denominational newspaper.

Gaustad knew about Herald of Truth, but he must not have been impressed, and after all those millions spent on it! Nor did he adjudge our vast building programs as of any particular significance. The "anti" movement will no doubt feel left out, for there is not the slightest reference to any of them or any of their several papers. Abilene may be neglected as a center of influence, not getting the attention that we would give to it had we been writing the essay. Only Pepperdine among the colleges receives special mention, and that in reference to its efforts to integrate, and Norvel Young is the only president mentioned in the study.

There should have been some reference to our extensive efforts to heal our divisive wounds. Unity meetings have now been held across the country and the lines of communication are being re-established. This is a significent fact in these days of ecumenical concerns.

As for the papers, the *Gospel Advocate* barely makes it, once in reference to a hymnal it advertised back in 1912 and once in quoting Norvel Young, while Carl Ketcherside and *Mission Messenger* are given extensive treatment. The *Firm Foundation* is not quoted even once, while *Mission* is drawn from more than once and at length, as is the *20th Century Christian.* And we are pleased that the researchist found *Restoration Review* helpful in his study, quoting as he did from four of our writers.

Zebedee Bishop, a Negro minister in Detroit, and Ira North of Madison, Tenn., are the only ministers referred to. The Negro minister is mentioned in reference to his plea that restoration has something to do with restoring a genuine sense of community among all men.

We refer to some of these details as an indication of what is going on among us and what is being said that appears to be of some importance by one who is responsibly looking at us from without.

Gaustad's report is both interesting and informative. It give us a place on the religious spectrum. We commend him for doing his work well, and we thank him for helping us to see ourselves better, the good along with the not so good. But above all we agree with his conclusion that there is a new drum beat within the marching ranks of the Churches of Christ.

The old drum beat is muffled and dying. Let all of us who have hope for a free and responsible brotherhood declare to all, those within and without, that the new drum beat will swell into a crescendo that will bear us on to victory.—*the Editor*

The most skilful flattery is to let a person talk on, and be a listener.—*Joseph Addison*

THE ESSAY BY WARREN LEWIS

We are publishing in this issue what will probably be the most controversial article ever sent forth in this journal. So it may be appropriate to say a word in advance as to why we are doing so.

It comes to us at least second hand, having been refused (though apparently accepted at first) by another journal among us. In the process it sort of got kicked around. The margins were adorned with such editoral comments as *Is this biblical?, This is Mariolatry pure and simple!, This is palpably false,* and even *Bah!* This must have been the work of a second or third editor, for the manuscript had been prepared for the typesetter. We presume that it got vetoed on the grounds of being too far out, and it is far out—*for us.*

This is of course a good reason for publishing it. Our people are so seldom called upon to do hard thinking. Too much spoon-feeding. Too much is canned or already shelled. We should print more stuff that will allow *the reader* (not the editors) to write his reactions in the margins. You too may say *Bah!* to some of the things Lewis says, but we believe you need more opportunities to make this judgment for yourself.

In publishing the stuff that appears in this journal we give almost no consideration to whether *we* believe or disbelieve it, and not a great deal of thought to whether it is true or false. We rather ask: *Is there something here that should be said? Does it touch a neglected area of thought? Might it open avenues to new truth? Will it jar people into doing a little thinking for themselves? Is it reasonable, responsible, and informative?*

Warren Lewis' article passes these tests and so we commend it to you on those grounds. *Is he right?,* you ask me. The answer, as I see it, has *some* yes to it. But read and decide for yourself. I am your editor, not your priest.

But let me add that I chose to publish this article also because Warren Lewis wrote it. After making his way through our own schools, he spent several years at Harvard. Then he spent three years at the Pontifical Institute at the University of Toronto, studying medieval theology. Now he is studying at Tubingen in Germany, which is probably the most exciting graduate school for religious studies in the world today. He is the most dedicated young scholar that I know and has one of the most astute minds I have ever encountered. He is destined to become one of the most brilliant scholars in the history of Churches of Christ.

Yet he is a humble, Spirit-filled, Christ-loving child of God. He has a heart touched by God's grace and a mind that is expanding and growing to the glory of God. I am therefore interested in *anything* he has to say. I may not believe it, but if it is the fruit of his growing, searching soul, I want to hear it. Too, I don't want him to leave us. We need more like him, not fewer. So we should listen to what he has to say. And even if he *is* wrong in some of his views, think how much truth his creative mind will pass along to us through the years.

So we don't have to say *Bah!* Let's just say *Let me think about it!—the Ed.*

A VISION OF THE CHURCH

WARREN LEWIS

In the twelfth chapter of the Book of Revelation, John sees a glorious sign in the heavens. His vision is of a splendid woman who dazzles with the light of the heavenly luminaries and who in a kaleidascopic fashion changes her appearance from glance to glance. In a few short psychedelic verses of scripture, John captures the entire eschatological mystery of ancient Israel, the incarnation of God in human flesh, and the future of the church of Jesus Christ in the image of one woman. Who is this magnificent woman?

The early church was slow to recognize that the virgin Mary, the mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, was the single human figure in whom the abovementioned truths are drawn together. Only later doctrinal development called attention to the fact that Revelation 12 should be understood as referring to Mary, the daughter of Zion; to Mary, the mother of our Lord; and to Mary, the mother of the church.

In the following reflection on the significance for Mary of these verses, we want not only to let the words teach us their meaning but also to consider the very practical, immediate benefit to be realized by Christians whose vision of the church causes them to fulfill Mary's own prophecy concerning herself. We want here with all generations to rise up and call her "blessed!" (Lk. 1:43)

Mary, the Daughter of Zion

The first apparition of the woman of Revelation 12 is described in this way:

> "Now a great sign appeared in heaven: a woman, adorned with the sun, standing on the moon, and with the twelve stars on her head for a crown. She was pregnant, and in labor, crying aloud in the travail of childbirth." (Rev. 12:1)

This is the woman who had been prophecied in the hopes of Israel:

> Writhe, cry out, daughter of Zion, like a woman in labor. (Micah. 4:9)
> Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion; for lo, I am coming and I will dwell in the middle of you; It is the Lord who speaks. (Zech. 2:10)
> Sing aloud, O daughter of Zion!
> Shout with delight, O Israel.
> Rejoice and exult with all your heart, O daughter of Jerusalem.
> The Lord has taken away the judgment against you.
> He has thrown down your enemies.
> The Lord, the king of Israel, is in your midst.
> Do not fear anymore . . .
> He will exult with joy over you.
> He will renew you with his love.
> He will dance with shouts of joy for you, as on a day of festival. (Zeph. 3:14-17)

One has only to compare the powerful imagery of rejoicing and childbearing in these lines with the words both of the angel Gabriel in the anunciation to Mary (Lk. 1:26-38) and in her own prophetic song in which she magnifies the Lord (Lk. 1:46-55) to see that these words and thoughts have been taken up out of the Old Testament into the gospel of Luke to describe the conception and birth of the Messiah.

Mary is the Daughter of Zion, the one in whose "middle" the Lord has tabernacled for a while in order that he may be born from the womb of Israel, to live in her midst. Mary is the representative of the whole historic people of God. She is the heiress of Eve, Sarah, Tamar, Ruth, and the mai-

den of Isaiah 7:14. (Mt. 1:1-25) Mary is the true remnant, the faithful Israelite who bowed in obedience and humility to the mysterious and scandalous will of God that she should bear, un-wed, the Saviour of her people, Israel.

This is the woman whose image is seen in Revelation 12:1. A splendid woman, dressed in the glory of Jehovah's creation, the queen of the Jews, crowned with the twelve stars of the twelve tribes of Israel. She cries out in pain, the pangs of childbirth. She is bringing forth salvation. She has become by the grace of God the first human temple in whom the Spirit of God takes up his residence. She has contributed to the incarnation of God himself in human flesh. From her humility and obedience and willingness, she has cooperated with God in the creation of health and holiness in the midst of his people. She has given the Lord his body and in so doing, she has provided the bridge of continuity from the ancient congregation of Israel through the flesh of herself and her son to the congregation of the new Israel, the body of Christ.

Mary, the Mother of our Lord

The second apparition of Mary in the Revelation describes her in this way: "The dragon stopped in front of the woman as she was having the child, so that he could devour it as soon as it was born from its mother. The woman brought forth a male child into the world, the son who was to rule all the nations with an iron sceptre. But the child was taken straight up to God and to his throne." (Rev. 12:4-5)

Whereas in the first third of the vision, Mary was the representative of the Israelite folk, in the second third she represents no one but herself. Here she is the maid of Galilee, Joseph's fiancee, chosen by God to be the mother of God, the Son of God. She is opposed by the hideous red demonic dragon who makes a nuisance of himself throughout the book of Revelation. Here he is found opposing Christ.

In these few words, the whole life of Christ is recapitulated: Christ the Lord is born of Mary, but the dragon (in this case, using King Herod) seeks to take the life of the child. The male child who is brought forth is Messiah, Lord, and Saviour, King of kings and Lord of lords, and Mary's little boy Jesus. But the dragon is not yet satisfied. Again he seeks to take the life of the child. This time (through Caiaphas, Annas and Pilate, the religion of the Jews and the law of the Romans), he is seemingly successful. But no, the child is caught up to God: resurrected, ascended and now enthroned specifically upon the seat of Godhead.

Mary, the mother of our Lord, the one who accompanied her son throughout his life, interceding with him for others, (John 2:1-12) and at last, when almost everyone else in faithlessness and fear had fled the horror of his death, stood by. (John 19:25-27) Mary, the staunch mother of our Lord, stood by, suffering with her son, bearing his burden with him, herself feeling the rending of his soul for the sins of the world: "And a sword shall pierce your own soul, too!" (Lk. 2:35) Of such stuff are mothers made. Mary, the mother of our Lord, was no different.

Mary, Mother of the Church

The last, fleeting vision of the marvelous woman describes her thus:

> " . . . but the woman escaped into the wilderness where God had made a place of safety for her to be cared for during the twelve hundred and sixty days . . . As soon as the devil found himself thrown down to the earth, he sprang in pursuit of the woman, the mother of the male child. But she was given a huge pair of eagle's wings to fly away from the serpent into the desert, to the place where she was to be looked after for three and one-half years. So the serpent vomited forth water from his maw, like a river, after the woman to sweep her away in the current. But the earth came to her rescue; it opened its mouth and swallowed the river thrown up out of the dragon's gorge. Then the dragon was enraged with the woman and went away to make war on the rest of her children, that is, on all who obey God's commandments and bear witness for Jesus." (Rev. 12:6, 13-17)

Who is this woman clothed with the sun? At first, she is the daughter of Zion. Next, she is Mary, mother of Jesus. But now, as John peers forward into the darkness of the future, the lasting image he glimpses is of a persecuted, fleeing woman, assisted by the earth and God. She is a woman who with her children is engaged in an eternal battle against the Evil One. She is Mary of Israel, the mother of the Lord, who is now as well—and quite naturally—seen to be the mother of the Lord's brothers and sisters. She is Mary, mother of those who obey the commandments of God. She is Mary, mother of those who bear witness for Jesus. She is Mary, mother of the church of Jesus Christ.

What does it mean for Mary to be the mother of the church? It means that the woman who was the faithful handmaid of the Lord is now the type or image of faithfulness in whose likeness the bride of Christ, the church, is to be fashioned. It means that the woman from whom our Lord took his body, at whose breasts he sucked, on whose knees he was handled, and from whose mouth and perfect love he learned the Law and the Prophets—this woman is the mother of any brothers or sisters whom the elder brother is to have. It means that Mary, present on Pentecost, takes her place with the apostles in the rule of the church. (Acts 1:15f) It means that her personality and her way of life, now taken up for use by the Holy Spirit, are one definition of holiness. It means that if God is our father and Jesus is our big brother, then Mary is our mother in the faith. It means, therefore, that we should look to her as children look to their loving mother.

Mary, Our Mother

There are certain very practical, immediate benefits to be realized in the life and spirituality of the Christian who reveres Mary as his mother. Among the many which could be mentioned, these three are especially important in our present situation.

1. A little girl looks to her mother as the ideal of womanhood into which she hopes to grow. To whom should the little girl Christian look to find an ideal type after whom to pattern her attitudes and spirituality? The little boy Christian has plenty of heroes from which to choose: Jesus; Peter, the robust fisherman; Paul, the Christian Pharisee; John, the loving visionary. But in our present American culture, little girls have no one held up before them as worthy of imitation—unless, of course, Mrs. Onassis or Mrs. Burton or the Playmate of the Month be considered imitable figures.

But there is a source of spiritual vitality and an image of chaste purity, ready-made and beautiful, in scripture: Mary, the daughter of Zion, the obedient handmaid of the Lord, who in her virginity and humility was of greater use to God than all the rest of womankind taken together.

We have a three-year old daughter named Phoebe. We want her to grow up sweet, chaste, faithful, and ready to do God's bidding. We want Phoebe to be like Mary. Because of this, we are teaching her to say, with Gabriel: "Hail Mary, full of grace! The Lord is with you. Blessed are you among women . . . " (Lk. 1:28f.)

2. Mary stands out in the gospel of Luke as a woman full of the Holy Spirit. She prophesies, she sings, she prays, and she is full of an abundance of the virtues and fruits of the Spirit: humility, obedience, grace, love, suffering, virginity, to mention a few. She leads a spiritual life second only to that of her son. As a result, she is led at last with him to Calvary where she dies a spiritual death that parallels the physical death her son is suffering on the cross. The prophesied sword has pierced her soul, too.

She is chosen as worthy to suffer with Christ, the greatest honor one can be given in this life by the Holy Spirit. In so doing, she helps to fill up what is lacking in the sufferings of Christ. (Col. 1:25) She has had a share in the redemption and salvation and mediation of the world to God. She stands before us as an example of holy living, worthy of imitation by any Christian. She can define a person's spirituality in such a way as to open him to the activity of God in his life through the Holy Spirit. She receives the gifts and graces of God in perfect reliance on the will of God to do what is good regardless of the personal consequences for the one whom he has chosen. Mary is our mother in that she has gone the way of the Spirit before us, fleeing and fighting the Evil One, and winning. Loving children want to follow their mother.

Mary, Vision of the Church

3. Our times are times of religious division and of attempts at religious reunion. Ours are times of confusion, of giving up the faith, of finding new faith, and of hoping for a future that will be better than the past has been. We are seeking to do away with war and poverty, with international misunderstanding and backyard hatreds. We are seeking to control the creation with technology and one another with sociology. We stand in the vestibule either of something which closely resembles the millennial dawn or hell.

The church is the human agency of the Almighty in whom he declares his will and his kingdom before the assembly of men and angels in this world. How is the church of the future to be equal to the tasks set before her? The simple answer of scripture to this all-important question is this following affirmation: the church, who is the body of Christ, derives her essential nature not only from Christ, her head, but also from Mary her mother. This happens to be my deep personal conviction.

When we look to Mary, we catch a glimpse of the church as God would have her. When we see the vision which John saw, the vision of the sun-robed, star-crowned queen of heaven who, in all her glory and brilliance, nonetheless cries out in pain and travail, we see in her single holy person

a perfect picture of the bride without spot or blemish, ready for the bridegroom.

As Jesus derived his flesh and bones, his psychology and his human mental powers from Mary his mother, so we, the spiritual children of Mary, derive our spiritual nature from our mother. If we are brothers and sisters of Christ, then we are born from Mary's womb. If we are united to the suffering and glorious body of our Lord Christ, then we are flesh and blood descendents of the virgin from Nazareth. And if we thus derive our spiritual nature from her, we will be like her.

The church, to be the church, must be like Mary: humble, open to the grace and gifts of God, a handmaid who says a simple "Let it be so" to whatever the will of God decrees, whether it be the scandal of illigitimacy or the rending and tearing of that which is most precious. Mary, mother of our Lord and the queen of heaven, was the simple little girl from northern Palestine who cooperated with God to bring Jesus Christ into the world. The church, those obedient to God witnesses of Jesus, are the children of this frail struggler in the wilderness. Her children are called on to do battle with the demonic dragon. They, like their mother, are to struggle until Christ be formed in them and, with her, to suffer to bring forth Jesus Christ into this world.

This is our vision of the church; this is what we want to be; this is where we are going. It is only in Mary's spirit that a truly ecumenical church is possible. Only the church graced by her presence and motherhood can fulfill the prophecy of the vision of the church which John saw. Only the church which has Mary for her mother can have Christ for her brother.

The promise to us who follow where Mary has gone is that we, too, out of the suffering servanthood to the world which God has chosen for us, will be exalted above the moon, clothed with the sun, and given the stars of heaven for a crown. John, the seer of the Apocalypse, has cast the image of ourselves eternally against the heavens: through suffering to glory; through Mary to Christ; through the church to God. Amen.

Warren Lewis is currently a doctoral candidate in the Institute for Late-Mediaeval and Reformation Studies, the University of Tubingen, West Germany.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST ESTABLISHMENT

But taking the measurements of the militant autonomous churches of Christ is no small task. They have no creed but the Bible; possess no brotherhood-wide ecclesiasticism; are opposed to legislative assemblies . . . Unlike denominationalism, the development of churches of Christ has not been steered by conference-table legislation. Its surge has been pulpit-centered.

—William S. Banowsky

When I was your age, the final authority east of the Mississippi was the *Gospel Advocate*, and west of the Mississippi it was the *Firm Foundation*. As someone has said, the Catholic Church has its Bishops and we have our papers.

—Clinton P. Davidson

All of us sectarians have our Establishments—do we not?

—W. Carl Ketcherside

When future historians finally get around to summing up the role of religion in America since the Revolution, the Restoration Movement, as it is most often called, will require more

than a chapter or two of its own. Such a chronicle will not, to be sure, endear itself to the group it studies if it performs the task honestly. But it will be a fascinating story of an exasperating, pretentious, diverse, and extraordinary people.

Burdened by a pretentious name and unreachable, if not indefinable, goals, the Movement has never quite lived up to its billing. In seeking unity, it has shattered into almost numberless fractions. In "restoring New-Testament Christianity," it has become what one young scholar recently called, with third-eye insight, "a passable second-century church." Of all its major segments, the church of Christ (which *Time* is rumored to have once pegged as the NON-denomination) presents the most colorful spectrum of ideologies and idosyncrasies in the most complex religious phantasma of them all.

Dr. Banowsky and the late Mr. Davidson, both astute and involved observers from what might mildly be termed "widely separated vantage points," agree in their conclusion that the college Bible lectureships, particularly the one at Abilene Christian College (Vatican West) are presently the most pervasive forces in shaping dogmas and channeling influence within what appears to be a very tenuous confederation of gnat-strainers.

They're on the right track, but the channels of power are infinitely more complicated than that. Borrowing a leaf from American political analyst Richard H. Rovere, who charted the American Establishment in the pages of *Esquire* a few years ago, we have here endeavored to capture on paper the shifting corridors of power and their inhabitants. The task is difficult, but also intensely rewarding.

It should be noted by those who would perpetuate the current "liberal-conservative" mythology that one man's position on the spectrum can vary widely with his *official* position. The capacity in which he operates at any given point can change his method of operation, his attitudes, and the result of his labors. The principle of relativity is very much in effect here. In line with this, we have attempted to achieve a centrism on the chart, while realizing that the actual center, or "middle of the road," in Christian thought is about two feet off the left side of the paper.

This chart is incomplete—very, very incomplete. It is an attempt to arouse, to awaken, to stimulate. It is, for those who can tell a joke when it's labeled, satire. As Nero has been reported as saying to one of his singed constituents, "It's all in fun."—*Anonymous*

CONCERNING THE FOREGOING

We have fallen heir to several hundreds of copies of the chart referred to above. This assumes, we suppose, that we have become a clearing-house for the Church of Christ underground. An underground that keeps office hours. Anyway, the chart is absolutely diabolical and fiendish. When they were all dumped into my lap on the Q.T., far removed from my home state, it was suggested that I was the one man in the country who could dispose of them properly, presumably because I have already lost all there is to lose.

Well, I may have no reputation left, but I do have honor. Some anyhow.

But to make short order of my sinful story, I bore the contraband across several states, and have since busied myself with placing one occasionally in someone's order of books or along with a letter. It is risky business, but I have resigned myself to my fate.

A letter came only today from a brother who heard that I had the charts. He wanted 100 copies, and he was willing to pay whatever I asked. He said he had seen one and that "it is the funniest thing since Gary Freeman's 'Funny Thing'." I now see that my smuggled goods have monetary value, though surely no other value. So, I decided to ration but a few to the greedy brother and offer the others on the black market.

While I am sinning I may as well take Luther's advice and sin abundantly. They cost me absolutely nothing, save the pangs of conscience for having them in my possession. Now I am to sell them at a big fat profit. Usually all such profit goes into the publication of *Restoration Review,* but not so with this money. Nothing common or unclean will defile the columns of this noble journal, certainly not filthy lucre. I shall lay it aside for a ticket to see the Cowboys play in the Super Bowl. All my evil conduct will then have its just reward, judging by past performances when the Cowboys play the big ones!

The chart is about Church of Christ preachers—and colleges, college presidents, publishing houses. But mostly preachers. It has them classified into 40 or 50 categories, all of them making up "The Church of Christ Establishment." It moves from "Left" to "Right", with those directions having their implications. And it is in color!

I have to admit that when you start connecting the name with the category that it gets right down funny, and it does give us another opportunity to laugh at ourselves. And there is truth in the irony. Some are "Saints" with Alexander Campbell ahead of the list, but J. Edgar Hoover is also there!

Carl Ketcherside and I are listed under "Freedom Riders", but we have company. And I know the others will just love that.

Some are "The Picket Line", some are the Foreign Legion", and some are "Gladiators". Then there are the "Money Changers", "Four Horsemen", and "Book-of-the-Month Club".

To the far left you have the "Picket Line", "Doctors of the Law", "Suffragettes". Then there is "Vatican East" and "Vatican West". There is the "Vaudeville Acts", "Children"s Crusades", and "Alchemists".

It gets real mean when it lists the "Blind Guides", "Provincial Sinecures", and "Court Jesters". We even have our "Holy Office" and our great "White Knight" (guess who?). To the left is "Black Power", while to the right is "Uncle Tom's Cabin".

On and on it goes. One brother only is placed in the "House Organist" and only one is "Single Shot". A number of enterprising sisters make the list, including the exorcist that we reported about a few issues back. The "Jet Set" is numerous, while the "Rich Young Rulers" are three in number.

Will you be edified? No. Entertained? Yes. Does it say anything? Perhaps.

In trying to guess who may have created this perfidious sheet, it would

have to be somebody who knows us well—very well indeed. Who else would know to classify one dear brother (God pity him!) as *both* a "Gladiator" and a "Blind Guide".

This is to say that the chart would not mean much either way—you could not even laugh—if you do not know the brotherhood like a book. Of course, you can always get a copy and hold it while the price goes up!

Only two to a customer and the two for 35 cents. Or a single one for 25 cents. That will bring in enough for *two* tickets to the Super Bowl. For I have taken the fruit to my beloved—and she did eat.

Oh, yes, I just have to spill one bean. There is one brother (?) placed under "So Near and Yet So Far." Lyndon Johnson!

For your tickets form the line down *the center,* please.—*the Editor*

UNITY MEET IN NEW YORK

The Fourth Annual Unity Forum was held in West Islip, N. Y., July 3-5, and since it has been our practice to report on these forums, we are pleased to say that it went very well indeed. There were serveral "firsts" this time, even though it was the fourth time around. It was the first time a non-instrument, main-line Church of Christ had sponsored a forum, though last year it was conducted by our premillennial brethren. It was also the first time it was held outside the southland, if indeed Bethany can be included in the south.

A more important "first" was the method of group dynamics that the West Islip elders elected to use as an approach to our problems. Led by Dr. Kenneth Schrable, a licensed psychologist of Concord, California, the forum of some 100 people were divided into groups of 10 or 12 each, wherein a kind of "group therapy" prevailed. Wearing tags with first name only, each one was urged to relate himself to the others in his group in an intimate, personal way, and not in terms of what faction in the brotherhood he represented, or whether he was a preacher, elder or Tennessean.

Each group also had its own uniqueness, with no group moving in exactly the same direction as any other. In my own group we began our first session by pairing off and getting acquainted with one other person. Once back in the circle, we would introduce our partner to the others, telling about him as a *person* rather than as a representative of some wing of our Movement. It turned out that in our circle we had premills, Independent Christian, nonclass, Disciples, and Church of Christ all represented, but by the time we found this out it did not seem to matter, if it ever did. We were brothers and sisters together in that circle, and we were all touched by Christ's love in a special way.

We talked about each other's strengths and weaknesses, even to the point of psychoanalyzing each other. We prayed together, confessed our sins to each other, and encouraged one another to use the talents given of God. We found a new dimension in *togetherness.* By the time we had our last session (there were three a day in these groups) we were ready to evaluate what it had meant to us. One sister said that she felt that she was really loved by others in the group, and with tears flowing went on to tell us of a very personal experience she had had with Jesus. Reluctant to tell it before, she poured out her heart to the delight of us all. She turned out to be the wife of one of our missionaries. Others stated that they had learned in an indirect way what unity was, that it had been experienced in the circle and in the forum as a whole.

One brother in the circle stated that one thing the group experience had meant to him was that hate had given way to love. He then rather jolted us by saying, "I hated Leroy Garrett, but now I love him." That touched me deeply, of course, coming from a man that I had not even known before, but I hastened to point out that this was a great victory for him, not for me. This taught all of us what these unity efforts are all about. They help us to overcome hate (or indifference) with love.

Since no two groups did the same things, we all had fun in comparing notes on our different experiences. In one group two people faced each other, placed their hand on each other's shoulders, and looked each other in the eye at length, to see what they could deep inside the other. This set the stage for their mutual probings. This "eye-balling" drew some criticism, mainly because it made therapists out of inexperienced people. Some thought it was even dangerous, and perhaps it was.

Lest I provide too much fuel for those who *look* for something to criticize, let me hasten to add that we *did* have some fine scriptural presentations, as well as very heart-warming assemblies with all the participants together. The most provocative, in my opinion, was an address by a black brother, Floyd Rose, on "The Hope of Unity Between Black and White." This bold approach to the racial question as a part of Christian unity was another "first" in these forums, for we must confess that we had about forgotten the black church in these gatherings.

Not only did brother Rose review the history of racial prejudice in this country, but he spoke of his own experiences in the Church of Christ, showing that we ourselves have done little to make blacks and whites one in Christ, but have even perpetuated the indignities of one race upon another. He told how as a boy preacher with Marshall Keeble he would protest the erection of a rope through the center of the big tent in Keeble's meetings, separating whites from blacks. When the invitation song was sung, he pointed out, brother Keeble would receive the blacks while a white minister stepped forward to receive those of his race.

He also told of his unsuccessful efforts to enroll in Abilene Christian College. Even when he confronted the college president himself, asking for a reason why he could not study there, he could only get a "Ask brother Keeble. He'll explain it to you." He finally enrolled in a Methodist college, he told us, " . . . where all those folks were that were going to hell!"

Time forbids that I tell of Dr. Robert Fife of Milligan College, who is always tremendous in both reasoning and scriptural exegesis; Carl Ketcherside, who would stand out even at a

summit session of kings; Dr. Robert Shaw, a Disciples of Christ pastor who is struggling for "a free and responsible brotherhood" among those who are obsessed with restructure; Dr. Harold Thomas, who is such a dynamic person that he really doesn't have to say much in order to benefit an audience, even though he does. Harold replaced Thomas Olbricht of Abilene Christian College, who was ill at the time.

I especially enjoyed Dwain Evans, minister at West Islip, who coordinated the forum. He is a delightful Christian who has demonstrated on Long Island what the church of our Lord throughout this country can become. No congregation among us is quite on "the growing edge of things" as is West Islip, and yet they are as faithful to the fundamentals as any. Their foresight and imagination in God's work on earth are matched only by the measure of criticism that has been heaped upon them by those who do not understand. "Blessed are you when men revile you for my name's sake" seems applicable to this group that has invested time and money in the black ghetto of Brooklyn rather than in real estate on Madison Avenue. And their Faith Corps is the Church of Christ's response to the Peace Corps. West Islip is surely a *salvation army* Church of Christ.

I have been chided for calling this congregation "main-line," which means it is within the general framework of what most of us mean by Churches of Christ. It *is* main-line. One can be *ahead*—a kind of *avant garde*—and still be in the mainstream.

We are sometimes asked if these forums cause people to give up their error and accept the truth. That usually means *do they give up what we oppose and accept what we endorse.* More specifically, it is sometimes demanded of us to name those who have given up instrumental music, as if this would be the criterion for judging any unity effort. Our non-class brethren could just as well insist that these meetings should lead to a closing down of our Sunday School system.

We are going to have to be allowed different criteria for evaluating unity conferences, for it does not necessarily follow that our problem of division is centered in things like organs, classes, and cooperative TV programs. It may rather be how each of us stands in reference to Christ. Surely we can all agree that men are brought closer to each other as they are brought closer to the Lord. We must learn that two men can enjoy fellowship together because they are in Christ together and still have differing views on many things. Our concern therefore must be *to grow in Christ together.*

This happened at West Islip. It will always happen when men are brought together for the purpose of glorifying Christ in their lives. And if we can keep this up, we can someday, manifest to the world that God's community on earth is indeed one. Men may not give up their organs or Sunday Schools, but they will give up their hate and indifference with all the littleness that these produce.—*the Editor*

READERS EXCHANGE

Quiet Fanatics

Someone gave me the March issue and another issue of your paper. All I can say is "More power to you."

I want to attend the next underground meeting. I am sick of the old formula: 3 songs, a prayer (cut and dried), another song, sermon, a song, communion (must be unleavened bread and no wine), etc. No Bible reading except a few quotes from preacher. No one says, "Blessed be the God of Heaven!"

Once at a colored church in Los Angeles a woman came up out of the water praising God. Was she ever "shushed up"!

My 17 year old granddaughter is Lutheran. One Sunday lately I attended. No choir. God was praised. At communion everybody kneeled, a sizable piece of wafer was put in each mouth as the minister quoted scripture, then wine from a cup. I am not joining however.

I admire that Dick Smith in the March issue.—*California*

We are attending a church here in Minnesota that is so conservative and tradition-bound that new ideas are practically forbidden, so it is like a breath of fresh air to get your paper, as well as a couple of other "liberal" papers that are thought-provoking. Only the hope that by staying I can help and a determination to be tolerant keeps me from finding a church home in another denomination.—*Minnesota*

Congratulations on the continual high quality of *Restoration Review.* I hope that you will always manage to continue to refrain from playing pope. Every time I read the - - - - I become almost physically nausiated at the degree of conceit required to pontificate.—*New Mexico*

After living over 85 years and being in the church over sixty, it is refreshing that we now have some journals that cause one to think . . . I am tired of slanted sermons and the "come to us if you want to be right." Which one of the 20 or more factions shall they choose, for all claim to be the simon pure facsimile of the early church—*Ohio*

We must learn to protest quietly and peacefully. We have no use for the carnal weapons of hate and antagonism, but of love. Quiet and loving voices from *within* will accomplish more than thundering cries from without. One should be no more eager to leave his church home than his family home. If we will surrender ourselves to Jesus, and ask Him to use us in His own way *where we are,* He will do so. If He wants us somewhere else, that too He will reveal. We need quiet and loving fanatics.—*Ed.*

Reaction to Elkins Letter

The article by David Elkins is a solemn testimony to our arrival as a sect. Thank God many are waking up to our anti-scriptural and intolerant posture. Too many in the church are just plain unconcerned. —*Oklahoma*

Don't we, so often, just make Christianity a game. A letter like that one really makes me upset with Christianity and the uses people make of it.—*Michigan*

David Elkins' experience is not too different from that of some of the rest of us. I have tried to be a free Christian all my life, but there are times when the pressures are very strong.—*Kentucky*

In reading the letter I found myself re-living much of my religious past. I was once in spiritual bondage, but no more! —*Iowa*

I receive quite a number of religious papers, but none get more attention than yours and *Mission Messenger.* I read them from "kiver to kiver." Sometimes I smile and sometimes I sob. The letter this month from the young Michigan preacher was sob stuff. I know how to sympathize with the dear fellow. The Church of Christ establishment unchurched me and my family more than 30 years ago. It was the best thing that could have happened to us. "But as for them, they thought evil against us, but God meant it unto us for good" (Gen. 50:20) . . . I love you fellows, but wonder why you stay with the establishment when you seem to be in such disagreement with them.—*Florida*

"Letter from a Disturbed Young Minister" was indeed disturbing. David Elkins and I were fellow students at Harding. I